arXiv:1511.04035v1 [math.CO] 12 Nov 2015

NIM with Cash

William Gasarch [*] John Purtilo [†] Douglas Ulrich [‡]

Univ. of MD at College Park Univ. of MD at College Park Univ. of MD at College Park

Abstract

Let A be a finite subset of N. Then $\mathrm{NIM}(A;n)$ is the following 2-player game: initially there are n stones on the board and the players alternate removing $a \in A$ stones. The first player who cannot move loses. This game has been well studied.

We investigate an extension of the game where Player I starts out with d dollars, Player II starts out with e dollars, and when a player removes $a \in A$ he loses a dollars. The first player who cannot move loses; however, note this can happen for two different reasons: (1) the number of stones is less than $\min(A)$, (2) the player has less than $\min(A)$ dollars. This game leads to more complex win conditions then standard NIM.

We prove some general theorems from which we can obtain win conditions for a large variety of finite sets A. We then apply them to the sets $A = \{1, L\}$, and $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$.

1 Introduction

Notation 1.1 $A \subseteq^{\mathrm{fin}} B$ means that A is a finite subset of B.

Def 1.2 Let $A \subseteq^{\mathrm{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and let $n \in \mathsf{N}$. Let $a_1 = \min(A)$. $\mathrm{NIM}(A;n)$ is played as follows:

[*]University of Maryland, Dept. of Computer, College Park, MD 20742. gasarch@cs.umd.edu
[†]University of Maryland, Dept. of Computer Science, College Park, MD 20742. jep1911@umd.edu
[‡]University of Maryland, Dept. of Mathematics, College Park, MD 20742. ds_ulrich@hotmail.com

1. There are two players, Player I and Player II. They alternate moves with Player I going first. During a player's turn he removes $a \in A$ stones from the board.

2. Initially there are n stones on the board.

3. If a player cannot move he loses. If there are s stones on the board and $s < a_1$ then the player loses.

Notation 1.3 We will usually omit the word *stones* and just say that a Player *removes X* rather than *removes X stones*.

Notation 1.4 The expression *Player I wins* means that Player I has a strategy that will win regardless of what Player II does. If $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and $n \in \mathsf{N}$ then we write $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ if Player I wins. Similar for *Player II wins*. If the game is understood we may simply use W.

NIM is an example of a *combinatorial game*. Such games have a vast literature (see the selected bibliography of Frankel [1]). Variants on the 1-pile version have included letting the number of stones a player can remove depend on how many stones are in the pile [4], letting the number of stones a player can remove depend on the player [2], allowing three players [6], viewing the stones as cookies that may spoil [5], and others. Grundy [3] and Sprague [7] showed how to analyze many-pile NIM games by analyzing the 1-pile NIM games that it consists of. NIM games are appealing because they are easy to explain, yet involve interesting (and sometimes difficult) mathematics to analyze.

We give several examples of known win-loss patterns for NIM-games.

Example 1.5 We specify a NIM game by specifying the $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$.

1. Let $1 \leq L < M$, $A = \{L, \ldots, M\}$. $W(n) = \text{II}$ iff $n \equiv 0, 1, 2, \ldots, L-1 \pmod{L+M}$.

2. Let $L \geq 2$, even and $A = \{1, L\}$. $W(n) = \text{II}$ iff $n \equiv 0, 2, 4, \ldots, L-2 \pmod{L+1}$. (We leave it to the reader to show that the case of L odd is boring.)

3. Let $L \geq 2$, even and $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$. $W(n) = \text{II}$ iff $n \equiv 0, 2, 4 \ldots, L-2 \pmod{2L}$.

4. Let $L \geq 3$, odd and $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$. $W(n) = \text{II}$ iff $n \equiv 0, 2, 4, \ldots, L-1 \pmod{2L+1}$.

This paper is about the following variant of NIM which we refer to as *NIM with Cash*.

Def 1.6 Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and let $n; d, e \geq 0$. Let $a_1 = \min\{A\}$. $\text{NIM}(A; n; d, e)$ is played as follows:

1. There are two players, Player I and Player II. They alternate moves with Player I going first. During a player's turn he removes $a \in A$ stones from the board and loses a dollars.

2. Initially there are n stones on the board, Player I has d dollars, Player II has e dollars.

3. If a player cannot move he loses. If there are s stones and the player has f dollars and either $s < a_1$ or $f < a_1$ then the player loses.

Notation 1.7 The expression *Player* I *wins* means that Player I has a strategy that will win regardless of what Player II does. If the game is using the set $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ then we write $W_A^{\text{cash}}(n; d, e) = \text{I}$ if Player I wins when the board initially has n stones, Player I has d dollars, and Player II has e dollars. Similar for *Player* II *wins*. If the game is understood we may simply use W.

Notation 1.8 If A is a set then $\text{NIM}(A)$ will mean the NIM-with-Cash game with the set A.

Def 1.9 Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$. Assume we are playing $\text{NIM}(A)$. Let $n, d, e \geq 0$. We define the state of the game. In all cases it is Player I's turn.

1. The game is in *state* $(n; d, e)$ if there are n stones on the board, Player I has d dollars, and Player II has e dollars.

2. The game is in *state* $(n; d, \infty)$ if there are n stones on the board, Player I has d dollars and Player II has unlimited funds. State $(n; \infty, e)$ is defined similarly. Note that $(n; \infty, \infty)$ is the standard NIM game.

Def 1.10 Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$. We are concerned with $\text{NIM}(A)$.

1. If $W(n) = \text{I}$ and Player I has enough money to play the strategy he would play to win in standard NIM then we say that Player I *wins normally*. Note that this is the same as saying $W(n; d, \infty) = \text{I}$. Similar for $W(n) = \text{II}$.

2. If either player wins by removing $\min(A)$ on every turn then we say he wins *miserly*. The intuition is that he wins because the other player ran of money though formally this might not be the case.

We give several examples of play.

Example 1.11 In all of the examples below $A = \{1, 3, 4\}$ and $n = 14$.

1. The game is in state $(14; \infty, 10)$. In standard NIM Player II would win $W(14)$ by always making sure that Player I faces an $n \equiv 0, 2 \pmod 7$. By a case analysis one can show that Player II has enough money to play this strategy. Hence Player II wins normally.

2. The game is in state $(14; 4, 4)$. The reader can check that if Player II always removes one then he will win miserly.

3. The game is in state $(14; 9, 9)$. We show that Player I wins using a strategy that begins miserly but may becomes normal. Player I removes 1. Player II removes $a \in \{1, 3, 4\}$.

   (a) If $a = 4$ then the state is $(9; 8, 5)$. The reader can verify that Player I wins miserly.

   (b) If $a = 3$ then the state is $(10; 8, 6)$. The reader can verify that Player I wins miserly or normally.

(c) If $a = 1$ then the state is $(12; 8, 8)$. Player I removes 1. Player II removes $a \in \{1, 3, 4\}$.

i. If $a = 4$ then the state is $(7; 7, 4)$. The reader can verify that Player I wins miserly.

ii. If $a = 3$ then the state is $(8; 7, 5)$. The reader can verify that Player I wins miserly or normally.

iii. If $a = 1$ then the state is $(10; 7, 7)$. The reader can verify that Player I wins normally.

The following lemma and definition will be useful throughout the entire paper. The lemma is so ubiquitous that we will use it without mention.

Lemma 1.12 *Let* $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$. *Let* $d, e \in \mathsf{N}$. *Assume that the game is* $\text{NIM}(A; d, e)$.

$$W(n; d, e) = \text{I} \iff (\exists a \in A, a \leq n, d)[W(n - a; e, d - a) = \text{II}].$$

Def 1.13 Assume $W(n; d, e) = \text{I}$. Let $a \in A$. If $W(n - a; e, d - a) = \text{II}$ then we call a *a winning move*. If $W(n - a; e, d - a) = \text{I}$ then we call a *a losing move*.

We are interested in the following problem: Given A find a win condition for $\text{NIM}(A)$. One could write a dynamic program that, on input $(n; d, e)$, determines who wins in $O(n^3)$ arithmetic operations, but we want our win conditions to be simpler than that.

Def 1.14 Let A be a finite set. A *win condition for* $\text{NIM}(A)$ is a polynomial time function of the length of $(n; d, e)$. Since n, d, e are in binary we want a polynomial time function of $O(\log(nde))$.

In Section 2 we define "rich" and explore the case where at least one player is rich. In Section 3 we define "poor" and explore the case where at least one player is poor. In Section 4 we explore the case where neither player is rich or poor. The theorems proven allow one to obtain nice win conditions for many sets A. In Sections 5, 6, 7 we obtain win conditions for $A = \{1, L\}$, $A = \{1, L, L + 1\}$ (L odd), and $A = \{1, L, L + 1\}$ (L even). In Section 8 we state a conjecture about the set $A = \{L, \ldots, M\}$. In Section 9 we suggest future directions.

2 What if At Least One Player Is Rich?

If $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ then how much money does Player I need to win normally starting with n stones? A similar question could be asked about Player II. In this section we define $f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ and $f_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ to be those amounts. We then consider what happens if (say) Player I has $f_A^{\text{I}}(n) - 1$ dollars. How much does Player II need to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat?

For n such that $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ we define $f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$. Later we will see that this $f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ is the least d such that Player I wins $(n; d, \infty)$. Similarly for $W_A(n) = \text{II}$.

Def 2.1 Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and let $a_1 = \min(A)$.

1. For $0 \leq n \leq a_1 - 1$ $f_A^{\text{II}}(0) = 0$ (Player II wins and needs 0 to win.)

2. If $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ then

$$f_A^{\text{I}}(n) = \min_{a \in A, a \leq n} \{f_A^{\text{II}}(n-a) + a : W_A(n-a) = \text{II}\}$$

3. If $W_A(n) = \text{II}$ then

$$f_A^{\text{II}}(n) = \max_{a \in A, a \leq n} \{f_A^{\text{I}}(n-a)\}$$

The following is a straightforward proof by induction.

Theorem 2.2 *Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and f_A^{I}, f_A^{II} be as defined above.*

1. *If $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ then Player* I *wins $(n; f_A^{\text{I}}(n), \infty)$.*

2. *If $W_A(n) = \text{II}$ then Player* II *wins $(n; \infty, f_A^{\text{II}}(n))$.*

Note that f_A^{I} (f_A^{II}) is only defined when on n such that $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ ($W_A(n) = \text{II}$) and we do not know what happens if (say) $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ but Player I has $f_A^{\text{I}}(n) - 1$. We now complete the definitions of f_A^{I} and f_A^{II} to deal with these questions.

Def 2.3 Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$. Let $a_1 = \min(A)$.

1. If $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ ($W_A(n) = \text{II}$) then $f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ ($f_A^{\text{II}}(n)$) is defined as in Definition 2.1.

2. If $0 \leq n \leq a_1 - 1$ then $f_A^{\text{I}}(n) = 0$.

3. If $W_A(n) = \text{II}$ then

$$f_A^{\text{I}}(n) = \min_{a \in A, a \leq n} \{f_A^{\text{II}}(n-a) + a : f_A^{\text{I}}(n-a) = f_A^{\text{II}}(n)\}.$$

   Since $f_A^{\text{II}}(n) = \max_{a \in A, a \leq n} \{f_A^{\text{I}}(n-a)\}$ we know that the set of $a \in A$, $q \leq n$ such that $f_A^{\text{I}}(n-a) = f_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ is not empty.

4. It $W_A(n) = \text{I}$ then

$$f_A^{\text{II}}(n) = \max_{a \in A, a \leq n} \{f_A^{\text{I}}(n-a)\}.$$

The following theorem has an easy proof that uses Theorem 2.2 and a straightforward induction.

Theorem 2.4 *Let A, n, d, e be given. Let $f_A^{\text{I}}, f_A^{\text{II}}$ be as defined above.*

1. *If $d \geq f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ and $e < f_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ then $W_A^{\text{cash}}(n; d, e) = \text{I}$.*

2. *If $d < f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ and $e \geq f_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ then $W_A^{\text{cash}}(n; d, e) = \text{II}$*

3. *If $d \geq f_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ and $e \geq f_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ then $W_A^{\text{cash}}(n; d, e) = W_A(n)$. (This follows from Theorem 2.2. We include it so that we can just refer to this theorem for all cases where at least one player is rich.)*

3 What if At Least One Player Is Poor?

Let $A \subseteq^{\text{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and $n, d, e \in \mathsf{N}$ be such that d and e are small– so small that the best strategy is to play miserly. If $d \leq e$ then Player II will win since Player I will run out of money first. If $d > e$ then it is not clear what happens.

We will define formulas and state a theorem that will make this all rigorous. In the end we will have determined which player wins if at least one player is poor.

Def 3.1 Let A, n be given. Set $a_1 = \min(A)$. Let $i \equiv n \mod 2a_1$. Then:

- $g_A^{\text{I}}(n) = \dfrac{n-i}{2} + \min\{i+1, a_1\}$.
- $g_A^{\text{II}}(n) = \dfrac{n-i}{2} + \max\{0, i-a_1+1\}$.

From the definitions of $g_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ and $g_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ one can easily prove the following.

Lemma 3.2 *For all n, k, we have $g_A^{\text{I}}(n+2ka_1) = g_A^{\text{I}}(n) + ka_1$ and $g_A^{\text{II}}(n+2ka_1) = g_A^{\text{II}}(n) + ka_1$.*

Lemma 3.3 *Let $a \in A$. If $d < g_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ then $d - a < g_A^{\text{II}}(n-a)$.*

Proof: We show that $g_A^{\text{I}}(n) - a \leq g_A^{\text{II}}(n-a)$.

Claim 1: If $a \in A$ and $a < 2a_1$ then $g_A^{\text{I}}(n) - a \leq g_A^{\text{II}}(n-a)$.

Proof of Claim 1:

Let $a = a_1 + j$ where $0 \leq j < a_1$. Let $i \equiv n \pmod{2a_1}$ and let $i' \equiv n - a \pmod{2a_1} = (i - a_1 - j) \pmod{2a_1}$.

We need: $\dfrac{n-i}{2} + \min\{i+1, a_1\} - a \leq \dfrac{n-a-i'}{2} + \max\{0, i'-a_1+1\}$, i.e.
$\dfrac{n-i}{2} + \min\{i+1, a_1\} \leq \dfrac{n-i'}{2} + \max\{0, i'-a_1+1\} + \dfrac{a_1+j}{2}$.

There are two cases, depending on whether $i \geq a_1 + j$ or $i < a_1 + j$. We leave the easy algebra to the reader.

End of Proof of Claim 1

Claim 2: If $a \in A$ and $2a_1 \leq a < 2a_1 + a_1$ then $g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - a \leq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n-a)$.

Proof of Claim 2:

Let $a = 2a_1 + j$ where $0 \leq j < a_1$. Let $i \equiv n \pmod{2a_1}$ and let $i' \equiv n - a \pmod{2a_1} = (i-j) \pmod{2a_1}$.

We need: $\frac{n-i}{2} + \min\{i+1, a_1\} - a \leq \frac{n-a-i'}{2} + \max\{0, i' - a_1 + 1\}$, i.e.
$\frac{n-i}{2} + \min\{i+1, a_1\} \leq \frac{n-i'}{2} + \max\{0, i' - a_1 + 1\} + a_1 + \frac{j}{2}$.

There are two cases, depending on whether $i \geq j$ or $i < j$. We leave the easy algebra to the reader.

End of proof of Claim 2

We now prove the theorem for $a \geq 2a_1$. Let $a - a_1 = 2ka_1 + i$ where $0 \leq i \leq 2a_1 = 1$.

$g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n-a) = g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n - a_1 - i - 2ka_1) = g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n - a_1 - i) - ka_1$ by Lemma 3.2 .

$g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n - (a_1 + i)) - ka_1 \geq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n - a_1 - i) - 2ka_1 \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - i - a_1 - 2ka_1 = g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - a$ by Claims 1 and 2 .

Hence $g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n-a) \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - a$. ∎

Lemma 3.4 *If* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n - a_1)$.

Proof:

We need to prove that $g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) \leq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n - a_1)$. But in fact they are equal.

Let $i = n \pmod{2a_1}$ and let $i' = n - a_1 \pmod{2a_1}$.

We need to show $\frac{n-i}{2} + \max\{0, i - a_1 + 1\} = \frac{n - a_1 - i'}{2} + \min\{i' + 1, a_1\}$.

There are two cases depending on whether $0 \leq i \leq a_1 - 1$ or $a_1 \leq i \leq 2a_1 - 1$. We leave the easy algebra to the reader.

∎

Theorem 3.5 *Let* A, n, d, e *be given. Then:*

1. *If* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *and* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor > \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n; d, e) = \mathrm{I}$.

2. *If* $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n; d, e) = \mathrm{II}$.

We refer to the above statements as Parts.

Proof: We prove this by induction on n.

Base Case: Assume $0 \leq n \leq a_1 - 1$. Note that $n = i$ so $g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) = \min(n+1, a_1) = n+1$, $g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) = \max(0, n - a_1 + 1) = 0$. Part 1 cannot occur since its premise is $e < 0$. Part 2 has as a premise $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) = n + 1 \leq a_1$, hence Player I cannot move so he loses.

Induction Step: Assume $n \geq a_1$ and that for all $n' < n$ the lemma holds.

Part 1) We show that Player I removing a_1 is a winning move. We by show $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n - a_1; e, d - a_1) = \mathrm{II}$ by inducting into Part 2. By Lemma 3.4 $e < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n - a_1)$. From $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor > \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$ one can deduce $\left\lfloor \frac{d - a_1}{a_1} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$.

Part 2) We show $(\forall a \in A)[W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n - a; e, d - a) = \mathrm{I}]$ by inducting into Part 1. By Lemma 3.3 $d - a < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n - a)$. From $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$ one can deduce $\left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor > \left\lfloor \frac{d - a_1}{a_1} \right\rfloor$. ∎

We prove a lemma which will show that Theorem 3.5 covered all the cases. We will then state a clean Theorem where all the cases are clearly spelled out.

Lemma 3.6 *Let* A, n, d, e *be given. Then:*

1. *If* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *and* $d \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *then* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor > \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$.
2. *If* $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e \geq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$.

Proof: This can be proved by taking $n = 2a_1 n' + i$ with $0 \leq i \leq 2a_1 - 1$ and breaking into the cases $0 \leq i \leq a_1 - 1$ and $a_1 \leq i \leq 2a_1 - 1$. ∎

Theorem 3.7 *Let* A, n, d, e *be given. Then:*

1. *If* $d \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n; d, e) = \mathrm{I}$.

2. *If* $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e \geq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{II}$.

3. *If* $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{I}$ *iff* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor > \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$.

Proof: We *do not* use induction. We need only use Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.6.

a) If $d \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ and $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ then, by Lemma 3.6, $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor > \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$. By Theorem 3.5, $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{I}$.

b) If $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ and $e \geq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ then, by Lemma 3.6, $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$. By Theorem 3.5, $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{II}$.

c) This follows directly from Theorem 3.5. ∎

4 What if Both Players are Middle Class?

Let $A \subseteq^{\mathrm{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ be given and understood for the rest of the paper.

Theorems 2.2 and 3.7 cover the cases where at least one player is rich or at least one player is poor. We now deal with the remaining cases.

Def 4.1 Let $A \subseteq^{\mathrm{fin}} \mathsf{N}$ and let $f_A^{\mathrm{I}}, f_A^{\mathrm{II}}, g_A^{\mathrm{I}}, g_A^{\mathrm{II}}$ be as in definitions 2.3 and 3.1. If $(n;d,e)$ satisfies $g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) \leq d < f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ and $g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) \leq e < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$, then call $(n;d,e)$ A-critical.

Note 4.2 One can easily show that, for all n, $g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) \leq f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ and $g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) \leq f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$. We do not need this result; however, it is a good sanity check on our definitions.

In general, determining $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e)$ when $(n;d,e)$ is A-critical seems difficult (although for specific A a pattern is usually obvious).

In this section we describe some conditions on A that allow us to give a complete winning condition for A. In the next sections we apply these to particular examples.

Let $(n;d,e)$ be A-critical. It turns out that $(n;d,e)$ are not the right parameters to work with.

Def 4.3 Let $(n; d, e)$ be the Nim With Cash state (NwCS for short). Let $m \in \mathsf{N}$ (think of it as the periodicity of the ordinary NIM game with A). Let $i_n = n \pmod m$, $b_{n;d,e} = f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - 1 - d$, and $b^\dagger = f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) - 1 - e$. Then $(i; b_{n;d,e}, b^\dagger_{n;d,e})$ is the *Corresponding State* (CS for short). Formally we should call it CS_m but in applications m will be understood. Note that when $(n; d, e)$ is A-critical, $b, b^\dagger \geq 0$.

When we pass from the NwCS to the CS we lose information. But this might not be information we need. Imagine the following: the game is in CS $(i; b, b^\dagger)$ and the player removes $a \in A$. We would like to be able to derive the new CS without knowing the NwCS. This motivates the following definitions.

Def 4.4

1. For all $n \in \mathsf{N}$ and for all $a \in A$ with $a \leq n$, $C_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n, a) = f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n - a) + a$.

2. For all $n \in \mathsf{N}$ and for all $a \in A$ with $a \leq n$, $C_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n, a) = f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) - f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n - a)$.

3. A is *cash-periodic with period* m if for all n_1, n_2 with $n_1 \equiv n_2 \bmod m$, we have

   - $W_A(n_1) = W_A(n_2)$.
   - For all $a \in A$ with $a \leq n_1, n_2$, $C_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n_1, a) = C_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n_2, a)$.
   - For all $a \in A$ with $a \leq n_1, n_2$, $C_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n_1, a) = C_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n_2, a)$.

   A is *cash-periodic* if there exists an m such that A is m-cash periodic. We will always take the least such m.

4. Assume A is cash-periodic with period m. Then we define $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, a) = C_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n, a)$ for some $n \geq a$ with $n \equiv i \bmod m$. By the definition of $C_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n, a)$ it does matter which $n \geq a$ we take. Similarly for $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, a)$.

Remark. In the basic NIM case, we could prove every set is periodic (possibly with an offset) using the pigeonhole principle. Here that is not possible since we cannot bound $C_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n,a)$ and $C_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n,a)$. Indeed, $\{3,5,6,10,11\}$ is not cash-periodic (this is not obvious), even if we were to modify the definition to allow an offset.

The following lemma follows from the definitions.

Lemma 4.5 *Suppose A is cash-periodic, and let $(n;d,e)$ be given; suppose $a \in A$ is such that $n \geq a$ and $d \geq a$. Then:*

- $i_{n-a} = i_n - a \bmod m$.
- $b^\dagger_{n-a;e,d-a} = b_{n;d,e} - c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i_n, a)$.
- $b_{n-a;e,d-a} = b^\dagger_{n;d,e} - c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i_n, a)$.

Hence if $(n;d,e)$ is any position, then we can determine the CS for $(n-a;e,d-a)$ from the CS for $(n;d,e)$, which is what we wanted.

If A is cash-periodic with period m then let $\mathbf{CS}_A$ denote the set of all triples $(i;b,b^\dagger)$, where $0 \leq i < m$ and $b, b^\dagger \geq 0$. If a NwCS is A-critical then the CS will be in $\mathbf{CS}_A$. If $(n;d,e)$ is not A-critical because one of the players is rich then the CS will not be in $\mathbf{CS}_A$. If $(n;d,e)$ is not A-critical because one of the players is poor and the other one is not rich then the CS will be in $\mathbf{CS}_A$.

Def 4.6 A *solution set for A* is a subset $X \subset \mathbf{CS}_A$ such that:

- For all $(i,b,b^\dagger) \in X$, one of the following holds, where we let $(i';b',b^{\dagger\prime}) = (i - a_1 \bmod m; b^\dagger - c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i,a_1), b - c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i,a_1))$:
  - $(i';b',b^{\dagger\prime}) \in \mathbf{CS}_A \backslash X$;
  - $b' \geq 0$ and $b^{\dagger\prime} < 0$;

– $b' < 0$ and $b^{\dagger\prime} < 0$ and $W_A(i') = \text{II}$.

- For all $(i, b, b^\dagger) \in \mathbf{CS}_A \backslash X$, and for all $a \in A$, one of the following holds, where we let $(i'; b', b^{\dagger\prime}) = (i - a \bmod m; b^\dagger - c_A^{\text{II}}(i, a), b - c_A^{\text{I}}(i, a))$:

  – $(i'; b', b^{\dagger\prime}) \in X$;

  – $b' < 0$ and $b^{\dagger\prime} \geq 0$;

  – $b' < 0$ and $b^{\dagger\prime} < 0$ and $W_A(i') = \text{I}$.

The following lemma has a straightforward proof that we leave to the reader.

Lemma 4.7

1. *If* $d > g_A^{\text{I}}(n)$ *then* $d - a_1 > g_A^{\text{II}}(n - a_1)$.

2. *Let* $a \in A$. *If* $e > g_A^{\text{II}}(n)$ *then* $e > g_A^{\text{I}}(n - a)$.

Theorem 4.8 *Suppose A is cash-periodic with solution set X. Suppose $(n; d, e)$ is A-critical. Then $W_A^{\text{cash}}(n; d, e) = \text{I}$ iff $(i_n; b_{n,d,e}, b^\dagger_{n,d,e}) \in X$.*

Proof: We prove this by induction on n.

Base Case 1: $0 \leq n \leq a_1 - 1$. Since $(n; d, e)$ is A-critical $d < f_A^{\text{I}}(n) = 0$. Hence this case can never occur.

Induction Hypothesis: Assume the theorem holds for all $n' < n$ and that $n \geq a_1$.

Induction Step: Let $(n; d, e)$ be A-critical. Let $(i; b_{n;d,e}, b^\dagger_{n;d,e}) = (i; b, b^\dagger)$ be the corresponding state.

Case I: $(i; b, b^\dagger) \in X$. We show that if Player I removes a_1 then he wins. Let $(i'; b', b^{\dagger\prime})$ be the CS that happens when Player I removes a_1. We want to prove that any NwCS that maps to this CS is a state where Player II wins. By the definition of X one of the following occurs.

1. $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'}) \in \mathbf{CS}_A \backslash X$ and the NwCS is A-critical. Since the real number of stones is some $n' < n$, by the induction hypothesis Player II wins.

2. $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'}) \in \mathbf{CS}_A \backslash X$ and the NwCS is not A-critical. Since $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'}) \in \mathbf{CS}_A \backslash X$ neither player is rich. By Lemma 4.7 neither player is poor. Hence this case cannot occur.

3. $b' \geq 0$ and $b^{\dagger'} < 0$. Player I is not rich and Player II is rich, so Player II wins by Theorem 2.2.

4. $b' < 0$ and $b^{\dagger'} < 0$ and $W_A(i') = \text{II}$. Both Players are rich but $W_A(i') = \text{II}$, so Player II wins by Theorem 2.2.

Case 2: We show that if Player I removes any $a \in A$ then he loses. Let $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'})$ be the corresponding state that happens when Player I removes a. We want to prove that from this corresponding state Player I wins. By the definition of X one of the following occurs.

1. $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'}) \in X$ and the NwCS is A-critical. Since the real number of stones is some $n' < n$, by the induction hypothesis Player I wins.

2. $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'}) \in X$ and the NwCS is not A-critical. Since $(i'; b', b^{\dagger'}) \in \mathbf{CS}_A \backslash X$ neither player is rich. By Lemma 4.7.2 Player I is not poor in the new state. Hence Player II in the new state is poor so Player I wins.

3. $b' < 0$ and $b^{\dagger'} \geq 0$. Player I is rich and Player II is not rich, so Player I wins by Theorem 2.2.

4. $b' < 0$ and $b^{\dagger'} < 0$ and $W_A(i') = \text{I}$. Both Players are rich but $W_A(i') = \text{I}$, so Player I wins by Theorem 2.2.

∎

5 $A = \{1, L\}$ for L even.

We consider NIM games where $A = \{1, L\}$ for some L. Since if L is odd, this is basically just $A = \{1\}$, we consider only the case where L is even.

So fix L even for the rest of the section, say $L = 2\ell$.

Lemma 5.1 $W(n) = \text{II}$ *iff* $n \equiv 0, 2, 4, \ldots, L-2 \bmod L+1$.

Lemma 5.2 *Let* $n \in \mathbf{N}$. *Write* $n = k(L+1) + i$, *where* $0 \leq i < L+1$.

1. *If* $i < L$ *then* $f_A((L+1)k + i) = Lk + \left\lceil \frac{i}{2} \right\rceil$.
2. $f_A((L+1)k + L) = L(k+1)$.

Lemma 5.3 *Let* $n \in \mathbf{N}$. *Write* $n = k(L+1) + i$ *where* $0 \leq i < L+1$.

1. *If* $n < L$ *then* $f_A^{\perp}(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$.
2. *If* $n \geq L$ *and* $i < L$ *then* $f_A^{\perp}(n) = Lk + \left\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \right\rfloor - \ell + 1$.
3. *If* $i = L$ *then* $f_A^{\perp}(n) = Lk + \ell$.

Lemma 5.4 *Let* $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

1. *If* n *is even then* $g_A^{\text{I}}(n) = \frac{n}{2} + 1$ *and* $g_A^{\text{II}}(n) = \frac{n}{2}$.
2. *If* n *is odd then* $g_A^{\text{I}}(n) = \frac{n-1}{2} + 1$ *and* $g_A^{\text{II}}(n) = \frac{n-1}{2} + 1$.

Lemma 5.5 A *is cash periodic, with period* $L+1$. *Moreover:*

1. - *For all* $i < L$, $c_A^{\text{I}}(i, 1) = 0$.

- $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(L,1) = L-1$.
- *For all* i, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i,1) = 0$.

2.
- *For all* i, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i,L) = 0$.
- *For all* $i \neq L-1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i,L) = L-1$.
- $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(L-1,L) = 0$.

Proof: Easy to check, given all of the preceding lemmas. ∎

Lemma 5.6 *Define* $X \subset \mathsf{CS}_A$ *as follows:*

- *If* $i \in \{0,2,\ldots,L-2\}$ *then* $(i,x,y) \in X$ *iff* $x < \left\lfloor \frac{y}{L-1} \right\rfloor (L-1)$.
- *If* $i \in \{1,3,\ldots,L-1,L\}$ *then* $(i,x,y) \in X$ *iff* $y \geq \left\lfloor \frac{x}{L-1} \right\rfloor (L-1)$.

Then X *is a solution set.*

Theorem 5.7 *Let* $n,d,e \in \mathsf{N}$. *Let* f_A^{I}, f_A^{II}, g_A^{I}, *and* g_A^{II} *be as defined in this section. (Recall that* f_A^{I} *and* f_A^{II} *are defined simply from* f_A *and* $f_A^{\perp}$.

1. *If* $d \geq f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e < f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{I}$.
2. *If* $d < f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e \geq f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{II}$.
3. *If* $d \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e \geq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = W_A(n)$.
4. *If* $d \geq g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{I}$.
5. *If* $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e \geq g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e,) = \mathrm{II}$.
6. *If* $d < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $e < g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *then* $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{I}$ *iff* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{a_1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{e}{a_1} \right\rfloor$.
7. *If* $g_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) \leq d < f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n)$ *and* $g_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) \leq e < f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n)$, *then let* $n \equiv i \pmod{L+1}$, $d = f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - b - 1$, *and* $e = f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) - b^{\dagger}$. $W_A^{\mathrm{cash}}(n;d,e) = \mathrm{I}$ *iff* $(i,b,b^{\dagger}) \in X$.

6 $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$ for L odd

We consider NIM games where $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$ for some odd L, say $L = 2\ell + 1$.

Note that g_A^{I} and g_A^{II} are the same as before since these functions only depend on $\min(A)$.

Lemma 6.1 $W_A(n) = \mathrm{II}$ *iff* $n \equiv 0, 2, 4, \ldots, L-1 \bmod 2L+1$.

Lemma 6.2 *For all* k*:*

- $f_A((2L+1)k + i) = \dfrac{(3L+1)k}{2} + \left\lceil \dfrac{i}{2} \right\rceil$ *for* $0 \le i < L+1$.
- $f_A((2L+1)k + i) = \dfrac{(3L+1)k}{2} + L + \left\lceil \dfrac{i-L}{2} \right\rceil$ *for* $L+1 \le i < 2L+1$.

Lemma 6.3 *For all* k*:*

- $f_A^{\perp}((2L+1)k + i) = \dfrac{(3L+1)k}{2} + \left\lfloor \dfrac{i}{2} \right\rfloor$ *for* $0 \le i < L+2$.
- $f_A^{\perp}((2L+1)k + i) = \dfrac{(3L+1)k}{2} + L + \left\lfloor \dfrac{i-L}{2} \right\rfloor$ *for* $L+2 \le i < 2L+1$.

Lemma 6.4 A *is cash-periodic with period* $2L+1$*. Moreover:*

1.
   - *For all* $i < 2L+1$*, with* $i \neq L+1, L+2$*,* $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, 1) = 0$.
   - $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(L+1, 1) = \ell + 1$.
   - $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(L+2, 1) = \ell$.
   - *For all* $i < 2L+1$*,* $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, 1) = 0$.
2.
   - $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(0, L) = 0$.
   - *For* $0 < i < L+1$*,* $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L) = -\ell$.
   - *For* $i \ge L+1$ *even,* $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L) = 1$.

- *For* $i \geq L+1$ *odd,* $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L) = 0$.
- *For* $0 \leq i \leq L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = \ell$.
- *For* $i > L+1$ *even,* $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = L - 1$.
- *For* $i > L+1$ *odd,* $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = L$.

3.
- *For all* $i \notin [2, L]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L+1) = 0$.
- *For all even* $i \in [2, L]$ *even,* $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L+1) = -\ell$.
- *For all odd* $i \in [2, L]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L+1) = -\ell + 1$.
- *For all* $i \notin [1, L+1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L+1) = L$.
- *For all even* $i \in [1, L+1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L+1) = \ell$.
- *For all odd* $i \in [1, L+1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L+1) = \ell - 1$.

Proof: One can see that this is straightforward to check without checking it. Note that this complexity does not show up in the final theorem; it instead reflects the number of cases necessary to consider in its proof. ∎

Lemma 6.5 *Define* $X \subset \mathsf{CS}_A$ *as follows.*

- *If* $i < L+1$ *is even or* $i > L+1$ *is odd then* $(i, x, y) \in X$ *iff* $x \leq \left\lfloor \frac{y}{L-1} \right\rfloor (L-1)$.
- *If* $i < L+1$ *is odd or* $i > L+1$ *is even then* $(i, x, y) \in X$ *iff* $y > \left\lfloor \frac{x}{L-1} \right\rfloor (L-1)$.
- *If* $i = L+1$ *then* $(i, x, y) \in X$ *iff* $y \geq \left\lfloor \frac{x}{L-1} \right\rfloor (L-1)$.

Then X *is a solution set for* A.

This yields an explicit description of W_A^{cash}, as for $A = \{1, L\}$.

7 $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$ for L Even

We consider NIM games where $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$ for some even L. So fix L even for the rest of this section, say $L = 2\ell$.

Note that g_A^{I} and g_A^{II} are the same as before since these functions only depend on $\min(A)$.

Lemma 7.1 $W_A(n) = \mathrm{II}$ *iff* $n \equiv 0, 2, 4 \ldots, L-2 \bmod 2L$.

Lemma 7.2 *For all k:*

- $f_A(2Lk+i) = \dfrac{3Lk}{2} + \left\lceil \dfrac{i}{2} \right\rceil$ *for* $0 \le i < L$.
- $f_A(2Lk+i) = \dfrac{3Lk}{2} + L + \left\lceil \dfrac{i-L}{2} \right\rceil$ *for* $L \le i \le 2L-1$.

Lemma 7.3 *For all k:*

- $f_A^{\perp}(2Lk+i) = \dfrac{3Lk}{2} + \left\lfloor \dfrac{i}{2} \right\rfloor$ *for* $0 \le i < L+1$.
- $f_A^{\perp}(2Lk+i) = \dfrac{3Lk}{2} + L + \left\lfloor \dfrac{i-L}{2} \right\rfloor$ *for* $L+1 \le i < 2L$.

Lemma 7.4 *A is strictly cash-periodic with period $2L$. Moreover, if we let $\mathbf{G}_A = (G, \ell^{\mathrm{I}}, \ell^{\mathrm{II}}, h)$ then:*

1.
   - *For all $i < 2L$ with $i \neq L, L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i,1) = 0$.*
   - *For $i = L, L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i,1) = \ell$.*
   - *For all $i < 2L$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i,1) = 0$.*
2.
   - *For all even $i \notin [1, L-1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i,L) = 0$.*
   - *For all odd $i \notin [1, L-1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i,L) = 1$.*

- *For all even* $i \in [1, L-1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L) = -\ell$.
- *For all odd* $i \in [1, L-1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L) = -\ell + 1$.
- *For all even* $i < L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = \ell$.
- *For all odd* $i < L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = \ell - 1$.
- *For all even* $i \geq L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = L$.
- *For all odd* $i \geq L+1$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L) = L - 1$.

3.
- *For all* $i \notin [2, L-1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L+1) = 0$.
- *For all* $i \in [2, L-1]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{I}}(i, L+1) = -\ell$.
- *For all* $i \notin [1, L]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L+1) = L$.
- *For all* $i \in [1, L]$, $c_A^{\mathrm{II}}(i, L+1) = \ell$.

Lemma 7.5 *Define* $X \subset \mathsf{CS}_A$ *as follows:*

- *If* $i < 2L$ *is odd, or if* $i = L$, *then* $(i, x, y) \in X$ *iff* $y \geq \left\lfloor \frac{b}{\ell} \right\rfloor \ell$.
- *If* $i < 2L$ *is even and* $i \neq L$, *then* $(i, x, y) \in X$ *iff* $x < \left\lfloor \frac{y}{\ell} \right\rfloor \ell$.

Then X *is a solution set for* A.

8 Conjecture about $A = \{L, \ldots, M\}$

We have written a program that will, for a set A, produce a candidate for $f_A^{\mathrm{I}}, f_A^{\mathrm{II}}$ and X. Note that $g_A^{\mathrm{I}}, g_A^{\mathrm{II}}$ only depend on $a_1 = \min(A)$ so it is trivial to obtain g_A^{I}. Based on this programs output we have the following conjectures about $A = \{L, \ldots, M\}$.

Conjecture 8.1 *Let* $L \leq M$ *and* $A = \{L, \ldots, M\}$. *Then*

1. *There is an offset* Θ, *depending on* L, M *such that*

(a) $(\forall n \geq \Theta)[f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n+L+M) = f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) + M]$

(b) $(\forall n \geq \Theta)[f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n+L+M) = f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) + M]$

2. $\Theta \leq 5(M-L)^2 + 2$

3. *If* $M \geq 2L$ *then* $\Theta = 2(L+1)$.

Def 8.2 Let X be the set of all triples $(i, b, b^\dagger)$ where:

- $0 \leq i < L+M$ and $b, b^\dagger \geq 0$.
- if $i < L$ then $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{L} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{b^\dagger}{L} \right\rfloor$.
- If $L \leq i < 2L$ then $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{L} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{b^\dagger - L}{L} \right\rfloor$.
- If $2L \leq i < 3L$ then $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{L} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{b^\dagger - 3L + i + 1}{L} \right\rfloor$.
- If $i \geq 3L$ then $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{L} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{b^\dagger}{L} \right\rfloor$.

Conjecture 2. Suppose (n, d, e) is A-critical. Let $(i, b, b^\dagger)$ be $(n \bmod (L+M), f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(n) - d - 1, f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(n) - e - 1)$. Then $WC_A(n, d, e) = \mathrm{I}$ iff $(i, b, b^\dagger) \in X$.

Hence WC_A is poly-log in (n, d, e) and quadratic in L, M.

9 Summary and Open Questions

We have proven general theorems about who wins $\mathrm{NIM}(A)$ with cash when either (1) at least one of the players is rich, or (2) at least one of the players is poor. We have also determined some conditions so that we can determine what happens when both players are middle class. We applied these theorems to determine exactly who wins when $A = \{1, L\}$ and $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$. We also have a conjecture for $A = \{L, \ldots, M\}$.

For every finite set A there is a nice form for the functions f_A^{I} and f_A^{II}. Using what we know about $A = \{1, L\}$ and $A = \{1, L, L+1\}$, and our conjecture about $\{L, \ldots, M\}$ the following conjecture seems reasonable:

For all finite sets A there exists $A, B, c_0, \ldots, c_{L-1}$ such that for all $m \in \mathsf{N}$, for all $0 \leq i \leq L-1$, $f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(Am+i) = Bm + c_i$. Similar for f_A^{II}.

Alas this is not true. Let $A = \{3, 5, 6, 10, 11\}$. The functions f_A^{I} and f_A^{II} are in the appendix. They violate the conjecture in two ways: (1) the values of f_A^{I} and f_A^{II} for $n \leq 63$ do not follow a nice pattern, and (2) the values of f_A^{I} and f_A^{II} for $n \geq 64$ have a pattern mod 16 (yeah!) but the value of B in the conjecture is sometimes 10 and sometimes 11, so not just one value. In light of the counterexample here is a conjecture:

For all finite sets A there exists $M, A, B_0, \ldots, B_{L-1}, c_0, \ldots, c_{L-1}$ such that for all $m \geq M$, for all $0 \leq i \leq L-1$, $f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(Am+i) = B_i m + c_i$. Similar for f_A^{II}.

More generally, is there always a nice win condition? We think so and state two conjectures about this.

- There is an algorithm that will, given a finite set A, output a win condition for $\mathrm{NIM}(A)$.
- For every finite set A there is a win condition for $\mathrm{NIM}(A)$.

10 Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Maryland Center for Undergraduate Research. The authors would also like to Steve Cable and Sam Zbarsky for helpful discussions.

11 Appendix: f_A^{I} and f_A^{II} for $A = \{3, 5, 6, 10, 11\}$

For $0 \leq n \leq 63$ f_A^{I} and f_A^{II} do not follow any real pattern. For $k \geq 4$ the following holds.

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+0) &= 11k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+1) &= 10k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+2) &= 11k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+3) &= 10k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+4) &= 10k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+5) &= 11k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+6) &= 10k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+7) &= 10k+6 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+8) &= 11k+6 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+9) &= 10k+8 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+10) &= 11k+10 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+11) &= 10k+10 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+12) &= 10k+8 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+13) &= 11k+11 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+14) &= 10k+10 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{I}}(16k+15) &= 10k+11
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+0) &= 11k \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+1) &= 10k \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+2) &= 11k \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+3) &= 11k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+4) &= 11k-1 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+5) &= 11k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+6) &= 11k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+7) &= 11k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+8) &= 11k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+9) &= 10k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+10) &= 11k+3 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+11) &= 11k+6 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+12) &= 11k+5 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+13) &= 11k+10 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+14) &= 11k+6 \\
f_A^{\mathrm{II}}(16k+15) &= 11k+10
\end{aligned}
$$

References

[1] A. Fraenkel. Selected bibliography on combinatorial games. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, DS2, 1994. `http://www.combinatorics.org`, Dynamic Survey.

[2] A. Fraenkel and A. Kotzig. Partizan octal games; partizan subtraction games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 16:145–154, 1987. `http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF01780638`.

[3] P. Grundy. Mathematics and games. *Eueka*, 2:6–8, 1939.

[4] A. Holshouser and H. Reiter. One pile NIM with arbitrary move function. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 10, 2003. `http://www.combinatorics.org`, Dynamic Survey.

[5] J. Propp. On the cookie game. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 20:313–324, 1992. `http://faculty.uml.edu/jpropp/articles.html`.

[6] J. Propp. Three-person impartial games. *TCS*, 223:263–278, 2000. `http://faculty.uml.edu/jpropp/articles.html`.

[7] R. Sprague. Uber mathematische kampsfpiele. *Tohoku Math*, 41:438–444, 1936.